FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

745 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10151
Telephone: (212) 588-0800
Facsimile: (212) 588-0500
E-mail: Firm@flhlaw.com

FACSIMILE COVER LETTER

To:	U.S. Patent Office Examiner Backheam Tiv
Firm:	Group Art Unit 2151
Facsimile:	571-273-5654
From:	Thomas F. Presson
Date:	March 25, 2009
Re:	US Patent Application Serial No. 10/701,014 Our Ref.: 450133-04878
Number of Pages: (including cover page)	8

If you do not receive all pages or are unable to read the transmission, please call (212) 588-0800.

00641051.DOC

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant	:	Mai, Anthony
Serial No.	:	10/701,014
For	:	REDUNDANCY LISTS IN A PEER-TO-PEER RELAY NETWORK
Filed	:	November 3, 2003
Examiner	:	Tiv, Backhean
Art Unit	:	2151
Confirmation No.	:	5854

745 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10151
(212) 588-0800

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

Date of Transmission: _____

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via Electronic Filing Services on the date indicated above.

_____
(Typed or printed name of person signing transmittal)

_____
(Signature of Person signing transmittal)

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
AND PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicant hereby petitions for a one-month extension of time to respond to the Non-Final Office Action dated December 8, 2008, having an extended period for response set to expire on April 8, 2009. Applicant submits herewith an electronic payment in the amount of $130.00 as payment of the extension fee. Please amend the above-identified application as follows.

IN THE CLAIMS

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application. An identifier indicating the status of each claim is provided.

Listing of Claims

1. (Currently Amended) A method of minimizing redundancy in a peer system in a peer-to-peer relay network, comprising:

receiving a first message including first identification information at a first peer system from a second peer system connected to said first peer system in a peer-to-peer relay network;

storing said first identification information;

receiving a second message including second identification information at said first peer system from a third peer system connected to said first peer system in said peer-to-peer relay network;

comparing said second identification information with said first identification information;

building a redundancy update message when said comparison of said first identification information to said second identification information identifies the first message and the second message as the same message,

wherein said redundancy update message is a message indicating that the first peer system is not to receive a new message from the third peer system because the new message has ~~an alternate path to the first peer system~~ a path to the first peer system which allows the first peer system to receive the message from a different peer system first,

wherein the redundancy update message comprises information identifying the first peer system as an origin peer system and information identifying the third peer system as a source peer system and indicates that a next message from the source peer system is not to be sent to the origin peer system; and

sending said redundancy update message to said third peer system.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-8, 10, 14-19, 21-24, and 26-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over European Patent 0 913 965 to Mahe (hereinafter, merely "Mahe") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,177,950 to Narayan, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Narayan") and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2005/0080858 to Pessach (hereinafter, merely "Pessach") and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0103179 to Damm, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Damm") and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2005/0063409 to Oommen (hereinafter, merely "Oommen").

Claims 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Mahe in view of Naraya, Pessach, Damm, and Oommen, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,701,344 to Holt, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Holt")

Claims 9, 20, 25, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Mahe in view of Naraya, Pessach, Damm, and Oommen and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,668,283 to Sitaraman, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Sitaraman").

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

> "A method of minimizing redundancy in a peer system in a peer-to-peer relay network, comprising:
>
> ...building a redundancy update message when said comparison of said first identification information to said second identification information identifies the first message and the second message as the same message,
>
> wherein said redundancy update message is a message indicating that the first peer system is not to receive a new message from the third peer system because the new message has a path to the first peer system which allows the first peer system to receive the message from a different peer system first,

wherein the redundancy update message comprises information identifying the first peer system as an origin peer system and information identifying the third peer system as a source peer system and indicates that a next message from the source peer system is not to be sent to the origin peer system; and

sending said redundancy update message to said third peer system." (Emphasis added)

Applicant submits that claim 1 is generally directed to reducing future redundant messages by sending a redundant update message to the peer system that would send the redundant message. The redundant update message (from the recipient of the redundant message) indicates to the sender of the redundant message that any future messages from that source peer system do not need to be sent to the recipient. The message indicates that the recipient (i.e. the peer system that sent the redundant update message) already receives the same messages from a different peer system.

This way, the sender of the redundant message will not send a message to the recipient in the future, thereby reducing network traffic.

The Examiner uses Mahe, Narayan, Pessach, Damm, and Oommen to reject claim 1.

Applicants submit that nothing has been found in Mahe, Narayan, Pessach, Damm, and Oommen, taken alone or in combination that would teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1.

Specifically, the Office Action concedes that Mahe fails to teach or suggest building a redundancy update message, and relies on Narayan. Lathrop, and Damm.

The Office Action states that Narayan teaches sending a redundancy message to a third party peer system. However, the cited portions of Narayan, specifically column 6, lines 54-

67, and column 7, lines 20-32, teach sending a name table from peer to peer. The name table is defined as "the mechanism by which each peer participating in the session has information and knowledge of all other peers in the session."

Applicants submit that this does not teach or suggest "sending a redundancy message to a third peer system." The third peer system, i.e., the peer system that is sent the redundancy message, from claim 1, is a peer system that sent a second message including "second identification information" that was compared with "said first identification information". In Narayan, the "third peer system" is just another peer system "that desires to join the session." This "third peer system" is sent the "name table" just as all new peer systems are. This peer system in Narayan does not send a second message including second identification information that is compared with "said first identification information" and therefore, does not render claim 1 unpatentable.

Furthermore, the Office Action states that Damm teaches that "a next message is not to be sent to the origin peer system." However, the cited portions of Damm, Figures 1 and 2, show a healthy ring structure and a ring structure with a failure. The ring structure is a bidirectional ring that allows communication in both directions for the purpose of failure protection. When a link fails, all the rings are made aware, and any affected traffic is sent in the other direction.

Damm does not teach a redundancy message that indicates that a next message from the source peer system is not to be sent to the peer system. Damm does teach sending a continuously small flow of information to all nodes on the ring to keep up to date information about possible failures.

The Office Action then relies upon Oommen to teach "sending messages to a peer using a different path." This is not a feature of the claimed invention.

Furthermore, cited portions of Oommen, specifically paragraph [0026] and Figure 5, recite: "All networks of type C, which have mobile hosts 18 joined for the service send a message to the Network B. And all Networks of type B, which receive the message, send a message the agent 20A in Network A. As is shown in FIG. 5, in a typical case there may be multiple instances of Network B (n/w B) linked to Network A (n/w A), and multiple instances of Network C (n/w C) linked to each Network B."

Applicants submit that this is NOT what is occurring in the present invention. Claim 1 reduces network traffic by preventing messages from being sent from multiple sources to one recipient.

Applicant submits that nothing has been found in Mahe, Narayan, Pessach, Damm, and Oommen, taken alone or in combination, that would teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1.